

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

7. Approve Ranking List, Authorize Negotiations, and Award PS-5172-04/AJR – Master Agreement for Consumptive Use Permit Assistance to PBS&J, Inc., of Orlando.

PS-5172-04/AJR will provide professional assistance with the preparation of Consumptive Use Permits and related negotiations with the St. John's River Water Management District.

This project was publicly advertised and the County received nine submittals (listed in alphabetical order):

- Camp Dresser & McKee, Maitland;
- Connect Consulting, Inc.;
- Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.;
- Hartman & Associates, Inc., Orlando;
- Hazen and Sawyer, P.C., Tampa;
- PBS&J, Inc., Orlando;
- Reiss Environmental, Inc., Orlando;
- Sarah M. Whitaker, P.G., Orlando;
- Water and Air Research, Inc., Gainesville.

The Evaluation Committee, which consisted of Robert G. Adolphe, P.E., Director of Environmental Services; Gary Rudolph, Utilities Manager; Hugh P. Sipes, Senior Engineer; Jeffrey F. Thompson, P.E., Senior Engineer; and Dennis Westrick, P.E., Manager, PEI evaluated the submittals and short-listed the following three firms:

- Connect Consulting, Inc.;
- Hartman & Associates, Inc., Orlando;
- PBS&J, Inc., Orlando.

The Evaluation Committee interviewed the three short-listed firms giving consideration to the following criteria:

- Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy;
- Similar Project Experience;
- Innovative Ideas;
- Quality of Presentation.

The Evaluation Committee recommends that the Board approve the ranking below and authorize staff to negotiate with the top ranked firm in accordance with F.S. 287.055, the Consultants Competitive Negotiation Act (CCNA):

1. PBS&J, Inc., Orlando;
2. Connect Consulting, Inc.;
3. Hartman & Associates, Inc., Orlando.

Authorization for performance of services by the Consultant under this agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the County and signed by the Consultant. The work and dollar amount for each Work Order will be within the constraints of the approved project budget and negotiated on an as-needed basis for the project. The estimated contract value is \$500,000.00/year. The term of the agreement shall commence upon execution and shall run for a period of three (3) years. At the sole option of the County, the contract may be renewed for two (2) additional periods not to exceed one (1) year each.

Environmental Services/ Planning Engineering and Inspections Division and Fiscal Services/Purchasing and Contracts Division recommend that the Board approve the ranking, authorize staff to negotiate, and authorize the Chairman to execute a Master Agreement as prepared by the County Attorney's Office.

**B.C.C. - SEMINOLE COUNTY, FL
PS TABULATION SHEET**

PS NUMBER: PS-5172-04/AJR
 PS TITLE : Consumptive Use Permit Assistance
 DATE: December 29, 2004 TIME: 2:00 P.M.

ALL SUBMITTALS ACCEPTED BY SEMINOLE COUNTY ARE SUBJECT TO THE COUNTY'S TERMS AND CONDITIONS AND ANY AND ALL ADDITIONAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS SUBMITTED BY THE PROPOSERS ARE REJECTED AND SHALL HAVE NO FORCE AND EFFECT. PS DOCUMENTS FROM THE PROPOSERS LISTED HEREIN ARE THE ONLY SUBMITTALS RECEIVED TIMELY AS OF THE ABOVE OPENING DATE AND TIME. ALL OTHER PS DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO THIS SOLICITATION, IF ANY, ARE HEREBY REJECTED AS LATE.

RESPONSE -1-	RESPONSE -2-	RESPONSE -3-	RESPONSE -4-	RESPONSE -5-
Camp Dresser & McKee 2301 Maitland Center Parkway, Suite 300 Maitland Fl 32751 Charles J. Voss, Vice President 407-660-2552 – Phone 407-875-1161 – Fax	Connect Consulting, Inc. 14596 Rolling Rock Place Wellington FL 33414 Gary E. Eichler, P.G., Vice President 561-204-4073 – Phone 561-204-4107 – Fax	Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc. 8651 Commodity Circle Orlando FL 32819-9083 Larry J. Danek, President 407-903-0005 – Phone 407-903-0030 – Fax	Hartman and Associates, Inc. 201 E. Pine Street, Suite 1000 Orlando FL 32801 Charles W. Drake, P.G., Vice President 407-839-3955 – Phone 407-839-3790 – Fax	Hazen and Sawyer, P.C. 10150 Highland Manor Drive, Suite 140 Tampa FL 33431 Damann L. Anderson, P.E. 813-630-4498 – Phone 813-630-1967 – Fax
RESPONSE -6-	RESPONSE -7-	RESPONSE -8-	RESPONSE -9-	
PBS&J, Inc. 482 South Keller Road Orlando FL 32810-6101 Robert A. Morrell, P.E., DEE 407-647-7275 – Phone 407-647-0624 – Fax	Reiss Environmental, Inc. 12001 Research Pkwy, Suite 228 Orlando FL 32826 C. Robert Reiss, P.E. 407-679-5358 – Phone 407-679-5003 – Fax	Sarah M. Whitaker, P.G. Hydrogeologist/Geophysicist 1028 W. New Hampshire Street Orlando FL 32804 Sarah M. Whitaker, P.G. 407-649-9930 – Phone 407-481-1195 – Fax	Water & Air Research, Inc. 6821 SW Archer Rd. Gainesville FL 32608 William C. Zegel, President 352-372-1500 – Phone 352-378-1500 – Fax	

Tabulated by Amy J. Rossi, CPPB – Posted 1/21/2005 (4:00 P.M.)

Evaluation Committee Meeting: 01/12/2005 at 3:00pm, located at 500 West Lake Mary Blvd., Large Conference Room

Short Listed Firms: Connect Consulting, Inc., Hartman and Associates, Inc., PBS&J, Inc.

Presentations Date: ~~January 27, 2005 starting at 1:00pm,~~

Presentations Date: January 21, 2005 starting at 7:45am, located at 500 West Lake Mary Blvd., Large Conference Room

Presentations Date: January 21, 2005 starting at 11:00am, located at 1101 East 1st Street, Purchasing Conference Room

Recommendation: PBS&J (BCC Date: 02/22/2005)

Presentation Ranking PS-5172-04/AJR - CUP

	<u>Robert G. Adolphe</u>	<u>Gary Rudolph</u>	<u>Hugh Sipes</u>	<u>Jeff Thompson</u>	<u>Dennis Westrick</u>	<u>Total</u>
Connect Consulting	2	1	1	2	2	8
Hartman & Associates	3	3	3	3	3	15
PBS&J	1	2	2	1	1	7

<u>Shortlisted Firms</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
PBS&J	7	1
Connect Consultant	8	2
Hatman & Associates	15	3

EVALUATION FOR PRESENTATIONS PS-5172-04/AJR CUP

B. Adolphe				H. Sipes		G. Rudolph		J. Thompson		D. Westrick		<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>
<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>										
Connect Consulting													
Approach to Project/Innovative Si	50.00%	86	43	90	45	92	46	90	45	85	42.5	88.60	1.48
Similar Recent Project Experienc	20.00%	87	17.4	90	18	90	18	85	17	80	16	86.40	0.83
Innovative Ideas	20.00%	86	17.2	90	18	92	18.4	95	19	80	16	88.60	1.16
Quality of Presentation	10.00%	85	8.5	90	9	90	9	90	9	95	9.5	90.00	0.35
	100.00%		86.1		90		91.4		90		84	WEIGHTED AVERAG	88.30
Hartman & Associates													
<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Si	50.00%	86	43	88	44	80	40	80	40	75	37.5	81.80	2.61
Similar Recent Project Experienc	20.00%	87	17.4	84	16.8	80	16	85	17	85	17	84.20	0.52
Innovative Ideas	20.00%	85	17	88	17.6	75	15	90	18	85	17	84.60	1.15
Quality of Presentation	10.00%	80	8	80	8	90	9	75	7.5	79	7.9	80.80	0.55
	100.00%		85.4		80		86.4		82.5		79.4	WEIGHTED AVERAG	82.74
PBS&J													
<u>CRITERIA</u>	<u>WEIGHT</u>	<u>POINTS</u>	<u>WTD PTS</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u>	<u>ST DEV</u>								
Approach to Project/Innovative Si	50.00%	88	44	90	45	85	42.5	95	47.5	90	45	89.60	1.82
Similar Recent Project Experienc	20.00%	89	17.8	88	17.6	89	17.8	90	18	85	17	88.20	0.38
Innovative Ideas	20.00%	87	17.4	88	17.6	88	17.6	80	16	85	17	85.60	0.67
Quality of Presentation	10.00%	85	8.5	90	9	90	9	85	8.5	89	8.9	87.80	0.26
	100.00%		87.7		89.2		86.9		90		87.9	WEIGHTED AVERAG	88.34



MEMORANDUM

TO: Peter Maley, Purchasing Supervisor
FROM: J. Dennis Westrick, P.E., PEI Manager *JDW*
THRU: Robert G. Adolphe, P.E., Environmental Services Director *RGA*
DATE: January 13, 2005
SUBJECT: Justification of Consumptive Use Permit Selection Short List
 Master Agreement for Consumptive Use Permit Assistance

The purpose of this memorandum is to report the recommendations of the evaluation committee that met on January 12, 2005 at 3:30 PM. Proposals from nine firms were evaluated by the committee. Connect Consulting, Hartman & Associates and PBS&J (listed in alphabetical order) have been recommended to be short listed for formal presentations/discussions:

The following matrix summarizes the attributes of each firm related to the specified project criteria:

Criteria	Connect Consulting	Hartman & Associates	PBS&J
Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)	Very concise aggressive approach	Good approach offering some new ideas	Detailed approach offering both short-term and long-term solutions
Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)	Team has extensive experience and working knowledge of issues	Firm has assisted numerous other clients in Central FL with CUP renewals	Teamed with modeling firm and experienced hydro geologist
Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)	Primary consultant has worked with County for past 2 years	Previous County experience for project manager	Firm has extensive experience working with County
Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)	Team has 50%+ availability in 2005	Workload projections indicate adequate availability	Firm has adequate staff availability to meet project deadlines

If you have any questions, please give me a call at extension 2040.

Signatures:

Robert G. Adolphe, P.E. *R.G. Adolphe* Jeffrey F. Thompson, P.E. *Jeffrey F. Thompson*
 J. Dennis Westrick, P.E. *J. Dennis Westrick* Gary Rudolph *Gary Rudolph*
 Hugh P. Sipes *Hugh P. Sipes*

Copy: File

	<u>Score</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
Connect Consulting	8	1
Hartman & Associates	16	2
PBS&J	16	3
CDM	22	4
Reiss Environmental	23	5
Hazen & Sawyer	24	6
Water & Air Research	36	7
Sarah Whitaker	38	8
Env Consulting & Tech	42	9

Evaluation Shortlisting PS-5172-04/AJR - CUP

	<u>Robert G. Adolphe</u>	<u>Gary Rudolph</u>	<u>Hugh Sipes</u>	<u>Jeff Thompson</u>	<u>Dennis Westrick</u>	<u>Total</u>
CDM	2	7	4	7	2	22
Connect Consulting	4	1	1	1	1	8
Env Consulting & Tech	8	8	9	9	8	42
Hartman & Associates	3	3	2	4	4	16
Hazen & Sawyer	7	2	6	2	7	24
PBS&J	1	4	3	5	3	16
Reiss Environmental	5	5	5	3	5	23
Sarah Whitaker	9	9	8	6	6	38
Water & Air Research	6	6	7	8	9	36

<u>Shortlisted Firms</u>	<u>Score</u>	<u>Ranking</u>
Connect Consulting	8	1
Hartman & Associates	16	2
PBS&J	16	2

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005


Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: PBS&J

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	<u>88</u>	(50%)
<u>REVIEW REFINE DRAWDOWNS - IMPACT - PROTECTIONS</u>		
<u>GOOD DISCUSSION ON MODEL SPECIFICS - MANY LIMITATIONS</u>		
<u>INTEGRATED MODEL - HGL'S</u>		
<u>STATISTICAL REVIEW OF ASSUMPTIVE DATA</u>		
Similar Project Experience	<u>89</u>	(20%)
<u>BIOLOGICAL AND MODELING</u>		
<u>ORIGINAL GW ECF AUTHOR</u>		
<u>MFL BACKGROUND</u>		
<u>WETLANDS</u>		
<u>S/C, BEEYARD, IND. RIVER, STRUWD</u>		
Innovative Ideas	<u>87</u>	(20%)
<u>IDEA - BARGAINING WITH</u>		
<u>INTEGRATED MODEL IN CONJUNCTION WITH LOCAL DATA</u>		
<u>WELLFIELD ROTATION</u>		
<u>DATA GAP ECF - INTEGRATED - TCUP</u>		
Quality of Presentation	<u>85</u>	(10%)
<u>FOCUS & STEP THROUGH</u>		

Comments and Notes: BUDGET - SCHEDULE WHEN WOULD
WE BE ABLE TO RESPOND TO STRUWD

Rater's name: BOB ADOLPHE

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM


Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	<u>86</u>	(50%)
<p><u>MODEL CHALLENGE - ADDRESS RAI CONCERNS</u> <u>WETLANDS/DULFANE ISSUES REGIONAL IMPACT SUSTAINABLE</u> <u>PERSUASIVE/COOPERATION - LEGAL STRATEGY</u> <u>MULTI PRONG -</u> <u>MONITORING DATA - (REAL)</u></p>		
Similar Project Experience	<u>87</u>	(20%)
<p><u>CH2M HILL STAFF 750 FC - 79 LOCAL</u> <u>ALTERNATIVE WATER</u> <u>ST. AUG, NWSA, CUP CUP</u> <u>SUCCESS IN CHALLENGES - 20 YR OVC, ST. AUGUSTINE, PAM COAST</u></p>		
Innovative Ideas	<u>86</u>	(20%)
<p><u>LOOKING AT SCHEDULE TO CUT TO 14 MO.</u> <u>SUBMIT NEAR COMPLETE APPLICATION BY APRIL 19</u> ← <u>ALTERNATIVE</u> <u>RETAILS, DISPERSE - ASR MORE EFFICIENT USE SOURCES</u> <u>DIRECTLY ADDRESSES STRAWD MODEL PARAMETERS</u></p>		
Quality of Presentation	<u>85</u>	(10%)
<p><u>STUCK TO FACTS</u> <u>SPECIFIC TO CONCERNS</u></p>		
<p>Comments and Notes: <u>MFL (NOT ADDRESSED)</u></p>		

Rater's name: BOB ADOLPHE

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Hartman & Associates Tt

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	<u>86</u>	(50%)
RE-EMPHASIZE GOOD ASPECTS OF RECLAIM PROGRAM		
MORE AGGRESSIVE APPROACH - ADVOCATE		
MORE ALT STRATEGIES		
INCLUDE "MARKHAM LAYER"		
CALIBRATION OF MODEL / ECF		SCHEDULE LACKING
Similar Project Experience	<u>87</u>	(20%)
CUP REVIEWER FOR SSRWMS		
10 yr PERMITS FOR 2 CITIES		
ASR SYSTEM @ CANAVERAL & TESTING @ PALM BAY		
WELLFIELD MGT.		
Innovative Ideas	<u>85</u>	(20%)
6 3 DEFINITIONS OF SALTWATER INTRUSION		
BREAKISH FOR		
WORK WITH LEGAL CLOSELY EDLP -		
TAKE UP OUR LOAD		POLITICAL PROCESS - MORE Active
Quality of Presentation	<u>80</u>	(10%)
SEEMED A DISCUSSION -		
RATHER THAN A MORE SPECIFIC PLAN		
Comments and Notes: <u>NO CONFLICT WITH SSRWMS</u>		

Rater's name: BOB ADOLPH Signature: [Signature]

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW-RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting - *Mat - Brenda* (1)

4

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy - Outstanding <i>Outstanding understanding of Sem Co' water quality & resource issues. - Persuasive - cooperative - persistent' in dealing with WMD. Face to face meetings important. 14 month CUP process saves money & allows more flexible options Have WMD personnel on site for AP's etc.</i>	90	(45) (50%)
Similar Project Experience <i>Palm Coast - Shulista - OUC - Orange Co - Melbourne - Tampa Bay water wide range of CUP experience including Sem Co. well drilling / hydrogeological experts - many years experience</i>	90	(18) (20%)
Innovative Ideas <i>Horizontal wells - potable/non potable ASR - low yield wells for irrigation. Technically innovative & experience with WMD very good ideas for solving CUP ASR w/ WMD. - set "approach" above - Outstanding</i>	90	(18) (20%)
Quality of Presentation - Outstanding <i>Outstanding & very qualified team. well organized presentation & graphics/visual aids Outstanding presentation - included a schedule for expediting CUP issuance with innovative approaches to working w/ district.</i>	90	(9) (10%)
Comments and Notes: <i>Chad Hill team members is a plus. (experience)</i>		

Rater's name: Hugh Sipes

Signature: Hugh Sipes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Hartman & Associates (3)

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy <i>Use the fact that Sem Co has been pro-active in water resource issues to push the District for credit</i> <i>Conciliatory vs aggressive approach - recommends aggressive approach - challenge Lake System MFL</i> <i>Review broadish and fresh groundwater well field management program</i>	88	(44) (50%)
Similar Project Experience <i>Tampa - minimum flowest levels 2 CUP's</i> <i>Clement - Deltona - Lakeland</i> <i>Asst for Commercial / Palm Beach</i>	84	(16.8) (20%)
Innovative Ideas <i>Get credit with award for Sem Co's proactiveness</i> <i>Be more assertive w/ WMD</i> <i>Obtain real world water model data</i> <i>Residential subfield review with</i>	88	(17.6) (20%)
Quality of Presentation <i>Fair to good - see comments below; but support the aggressive approach.</i>	80	(8) (10%)
(86.4)		
Comments and Notes: <i>Took a long time on describing the team & their qualifications (-)</i> <i>Also spent too much time describing the other projects as opposed to concentrating on Sem Co. issues</i>		

Rater's name: Hugh Supes

Signature: [Signature]

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: PBS&J

2

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy <i>Excellent to Outstanding</i>	90	(45) (50%)
<i>Review/Reform/Challenge Predicted Demand</i>		
<i>Statistical data analysis - Cost estimator</i>		
<i>Maximize conservation</i>		
<i>Wellness impact analysis</i>		
<i>GW alternatives</i>		
<i>Actual projected water demands</i>		
<i>Table 2 - TCEP</i>		
<i>Develop additional data</i>		
Similar Project Experience	88	(17.6) (20%)
<i>Sim Co experience - development of Sim Co TCEP</i>		
<i>Tampa</i>		
<i>Broward Co.</i>		
<i>Dade County</i>		
Innovative Ideas <i>Outstanding to excellent</i>	88	(17.6) (20%)
<i>Statistical analysis</i>		
<i>Local knowledge - Regulation - integrated modeling</i>		
<i>Understanding program application of TCEP model</i>		
<i>Integrated model</i>		
<i>Parameter estimation</i>		
Quality of Presentation <i>- Outstanding graphics - presentation</i>	90	(9) (10%)
<i>Excellent to outstanding</i>		
<i>Very strong team especially the model expert.</i>		
<i>Outstanding presentation - Outstanding team</i>		
(89.2)		
Comments and Notes: <i>Identified the two major issues with CUP for Sim Co</i>		

Rater's name: Hugh Sipes

Signature: Hugh Sipes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

2

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: PBS&J

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	<u>85</u>	(50%)
CHALLENGE ECF MODEL -		
Demo of Needs - MASTER PLAN UPDATE - of CUP ^{Active Table 2}		
WATER CONSTRUCTION - Readdress Heatna ^{County CUP}		
DATA ANALYSIS - LOOK @ Statistical -		
Similar Project Experience	<u>89</u>	(20%)
HOL - Helped dev. original REP MASTER 91-93 -		
↳ Look at complete hydro cycle not just IRAS.		
Working 4 County CUPS include ours.		
Innovative Ideas	<u>88</u>	(20%)
CHALLENGE MODEL ON NORTH T-CUP CUP.		
ARTS / MONITORING WELL		
Knowledge of New model - Integrated one. "MODEL"		
Heatna CC work issue. / Readdress Heatna - multiple		
Quality of Presentation	<u>90</u>	(10%)
IRAS's.		
Very nice presentation. GOOD USE OF		
Power Point.		

10

Comments and Notes: Need to be a little more aggressive. TEAM NEEDED to rehearse presentation. seemed a little non-committal.

Rater's name: Gary Lee Rudolph Signature: Gary Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

* Rainwater Harvesting -
- two YEARS to complete getting Permit.

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

①

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy MFL'S - EAST CHANDLER MODEL - CHALLENGE IT. Team REPORT - we are LEADING, connect working for US. Ed DeL. PAT - Legal - CCI Tech. solutions/Implementation Permitting Cooperative - TAKE NO DISTRICT allot - be persistent Work with Tech. staff. Wells 1st than others -	92	(50%)
Similar Project Experience - PALM COAST DISTRICT uses res MOORE ALSO. CITELUTO - TEAM involved in 20 yrs permit & OUC, ALSO ST. AUGUSTINE.	90	(20%)
Innovative Ideas - MADON DISTRICT concerns Regional Imp.	92	(20%)
Long term/sustainable - our approach best cost - for US - Push to get CUP in a 14 months. Push the RAI/computer application in. EXPECT RAI but most items complete.	90	(10%)
Quality of Presentation Very good presentation Good use of Technology.	90	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>World like to see a bit more aggressive moves.</u> <u>Very detailed approach. - *</u>		

Rater's name: Gary Lee Rudolph Signature:

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Two more ART's
 STEW - ? maintenance
 AT LARGE NATION area
 per form.

? EVEN BEYOND THE MODEL ANYWHERE ELSE.
MANHATTAN ART NOT OFFLINE (ONLY HANDED) Issues with Nurses paying across the street.

- Recharge Feature / Dispersal with individual
- Low Yield wells for INVESTIGATION
- Horizontal wells
- Potable / Non-potable ASU.
- Additional monitoring - Get ahead of the monitoring request.
- GIS DATA BASE -

- Reuse program
- ASU SYSTEMS
- OPTIMIZATION MODEL.

... .. MODEL WILL ANSWER TO meet GROUNDWATER Needs.

GET ART. 1111.01
 in the field waiting ART
 etc

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

3

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Hartman & Associates

System cost to us District has 3 days of work for each inspection.

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Aggressive Approach - Challenge map - Drive sub-divers Get better info for T&E DISTRICT MODEL. STAFFS Reports a needs - ATTACK RCP MODEL. USE OF POLITICAL	80	(50%)
Similar Project Experience - LOTS OF CUPS for cities Counties. UNDER THE RECALIBRATION ISSUE WITH THE SFWMN. NORTH MIAMI	80	(20%)
* Aggressive APPROACH at least one year "12 months"		
Innovative Ideas on top of hydrologic ^{innovations} vs using hydrology - Love them ASR's for Canal Port Auth. / PALM MAY SHAW well ASR well as Rehydration Study, Can set up add-on on how much doptic & Rehydration. Well management. TAKE TO	75	(20%)
Quality of Presentation ^{GOOD} Exp. in Administrative Hearings Nice presentation use of TECHNOLOGY.	90	(10%)
Comments and Notes: Not Very aggressive approach -		

Rater's name: Gary Lee Rudolph Signature: Gary Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

HAS STAFF FROM JUSTICE OFFICE THAT USED TO WORK WITH (Me Lisa Menden)
 KIRBY BARRON
 STAFF ALL LOCAL
 APT - How many he indicated 4 - Good validation tool
 7-10 DAY APT TIME - Then 6 months of data
 CRUNCH.

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: PBS&J

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy - Right tools, ^{optimal} Added Ralph Montgomery PhD for ecological impact analysis (statistical expert)	90	(50%)
Review/refine/Challenge Predicted Drawdowns also. Existing GW Source Optimization		42.5
* Demonstrate Need make Water Conservation a "cause", Document Reuse		
* Hydrogeologic Approach - HGL can used integrated model vs ECF Data Analysis/Statistics approach to evaluate surficial/wetlands	85	(20%)
Similar Project Experience No mention of working w/ ^{delta parts} impacts		17
Worked w/ County on NWSA CUP, Markham WTP/wellfield		
Prior experience in Seminole, Indian River, Brevard & Polk counties		
Modeling experience in same counties		
Lots of CF planning experience, incl Orange County		
Ecological wetlands assessment exper. - Peace River	85	(20%)
Innovative Ideas		17
Barter w/ District on Heathrow GC for GW		
HGL has working knowledge w/ District's ECF GW model		
Statistical Data Analysis, Existing GW Source Optimization		
ECF Model/Data Gap Review - Use Integrated Model for a "Regional Solution"	89	(10%)
Quality of Presentation Rainwater Harvesting, conjunctive use ^{structures}		8.9
Intro by Wayne Mather, followed by HGL (Sangeeta Pandey)		
then Ralph Montgomery, & Butch Neal then Wra		
Good continuity, stressed local knowledge, experience w/ SC		8.9
Only consultant to address costs		
Comments and Notes: <u>Noted that no APTs done for surficial aquifer</u>		
<u>Expect permit process to last 2 years</u>		

Rater's name: Ji Dennis Westrick

Signature: *Ji Dennis Westrick*

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

②


Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	85	(50%)
Will coordinate w/ de la Parte & Gilbert w/ Ed developing CUP strategy		42.5
Proposing a challenge to the SJRWMD's ECF-Regional GW model		
Persuasive Cooperation & be "persistent"		
★ Build Consensus, develop a "cooperative model"		
Similar Project Experience	80	(20%)
Obtained 20 year permit for City of St. Augustine		16
Working on CUP modification for Chuluota		
CH2MHill worked on OUC's CUP renewal - a 20 yr permit		
Innovative Ideas	80	(20%)
Submit "complete" application by April 14		16
Address Major District Concerns such as per Capita adverse impacts		
★ Proposing 14-month CUP process		
Work directly w/ SJRWMD staff such as Brian McGurk, have Brian observe fir		APT.
Develop addtl GW supply for the short term		
Quality of Presentation	95	(10%)
Excellent presentation outlining history, approach		9.5
and lots of supporting facts, pictures etc.		
		(84)
Comments and Notes: <u>Teamed w/ CH2MHill</u>		
<u>Successful in getting model thrown out at Palm Coast</u>		

Rater's name: J. Dennis Westrick

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Innovative Ideas

- Recharge features
- Disperse withdrawals
- Low yield wells for irrigation
- Horizontal wells (from surficial aquifer)
- Potable / Non-potable ASR

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Hartman & Associates

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Good, diverse project team, all CUP services available in Orl. office Presented Presented two options: 1) Conciliator or 2) Aggressive Also stated that County needs to emphasize what has been done to date Recommended Aggressive Approach contact Bd members, commissioners Strategy was somewhat general / too much Gov. time devoted to staff & their project specific exper.	75	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Expert witness testimony certified CUP experience w/ Daytona Bch, Lakeland, Deltona, Clermont, Palm Bay Lots of wetlands monitoring & assessments, also ASRs, MITs, injection wells	85	(20%)
Innovative Ideas - Get "real world" data (water level), parish Martchan Offered rules and land planning assistance MFL for Sylvan Lake - may be set too high - use hydrologic indicators + Lessen burden on ESD staff i.e. use site specific data Develop Fresh & Brackish GW Wellfield Mgmt Prgm. use structural ponds and residential surface wells	85	(20%)
Quality of Presentation Intro focused on technical expertise & experience of Firm/Team Detailed project experience presented for each key team member	79	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>Lots of experience in Central FL w/ similar issues & projects</u> <u>Good responses to questions by eval. committee, est. at least 1 year before CUP</u>		

Rater's name: J. Dennis Westrick Signature: [Signature]

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM

Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy Challenge SJRWMD groundwater model. Demonstrated insight into thinking of District. Recognized Ed DeLaparte as lead strategist. Multi-Discipline, Persuasive Cooperation, Technical Innovation, Persistent. Revise ECF by supplying local hydro data to District. (Confining layer), conduct APTs, ASR	90	(50%)
Similar Project Experience Connect has been on CUP Team for 2yrs. Connect has worked for Palm Coast in priority water service area. CH2M Hill responsible for OVC 20yr permit. City of St. Augustine	85	(20%)
Innovative Ideas Proposed 14 month schedule w/response to RAI #1 on 4/19/05. Low yield wells for irrigation, horizontal wells, potable/non-potable ASR, Seminole County needs to "reserve" part of the St. Johns River capacity.	95	(20%)
Quality of Presentation Extremely professional, straightforward, info packed and lucid. Very well organized. Timing could have been improved - ran a little long.	90	(10%)
Comments and Notes: <u>Overall Connect/CH2M Hill gave a very impressive and compelling presentation that provided an excellent approach to serve the County's needs. Should have spent a little more time on MFL issue.</u>		

Rater's name: Jeffrey F. Thompson, P.E.

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM


Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: Hartman & Associates

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	80	(50%)
Identified vast staff resources with connections to SSRWMD. All needed resources in Orlando. Propose that we push hard on District for extra credit.		
Propose more aggressive approach than the conciliatory approach we've used to force approve/deny-admin hearing. Evaluate wetlands that ECF shows are impacted.		
Weekly updates rather than monthly or wait for questions.		
Similar Project Experience	85	(20%)
Experience evaluating wetlands hydrology; MFL experience w/ Deltona, Clermont CUP.		
Successfully challenged South Florida District for North Miami Beach.		
Innovative Ideas	90	(20%)
Brackish augmentation of reclaimed		
Involved Management/Financial staff for Rates. Injection well construction, ASR		
reclaimed in surficial, More credits for effluent disposal than ECF model.		
Rehydration of wetlands. Develop fresh/brackish wellfields. Residential surficial wells.		
Quality of Presentation	75	(10%)
Good. No Frills. Very basic content. A little light on details.		
Comments and Notes: <u>HAI seems to expose a more confrontational approach w/ District while utilizing legal/political resources.</u>		

Rater's name: Jeffrey F. Thompson, P.E.

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

INTERVIEW RATING FORM


Date: January 21, 2005

Interview for (work): CUP

Name of the Firm: PBS&J

QUALIFICATIONS FACTORS	Points (0-100)	Weights
Proposed Approach to Performing the Work/Strategy	85 ⁹⁰ 95	(50%)
Review/Rating/Challenge Predicted Drawdowns w/ statistical analysis of ECF model. Propose bringing in 2 hydro firms (CCI + HGL - for modeling)		
HGL developed ECF & did peer review. Create Integrated Model from data.		
Biostatistifion - develop interrelations between Floridan/Surficial/Wetlands		
Continuity w/ prior work. Continue ecological wetlands evaluations.	90	(20%)
Similar Project Experience		
WOSC-1SGM model for Orange County		
Brevard Polk Indian River work.		
Work w/ Seminole County on preliminary CUP App through RAI#1.	80	(20%)
Innovative Ideas		
Proposed making water conservation "a cause". How?		
Noted that no surficial APTs are in Seminole County		
Rainwater harvesting? HGL use of/knowledge of WOSC-1SGM model.	85	(10%)
Quality of Presentation		
Very good presentation. Clear, but not particularly rich in details.		
Comments and Notes: <i>PBS&J seems to be a little reluctant to make definitive recommendations (perhaps overly deliberative). They did illustrate a "deep bench".</i> <i>Continuity</i>		

Rater's name: Jeffrey F. Thompson, P.E.

Signature: 

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Camp Dresser & McKee

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Restated basic CUP info
Good GIS support
Addressed MFLs
Not a substantial amount of insight offered

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

20+ years of CUP experience
less senior engineers on project have less experience

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

St. John's Co., Atlantic Beach, Indian River Co., Palm Beach Co.

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

PM shown as 20% available
less senior engineers shown 40%+ available

Score 75
(100-0)

79.5

7

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Connect Consulting, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

This is a REAL approach illustrating strategy and insight into the issues at hand; thoughtful and comprehensive, this was far and away the finest project approach submitted -- a model of the way these should (and so rarely are) be written!

Score 100
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

30yrs of broad hands-on in depth experience in the important areas. CH2M-Hill brings needed technical expertise to Connect's team.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Palm Coast, St. Augustine, Chuluota and (most importantly) Seminole County

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Project Manager is shown as 60% available, others on team shown to be 40-70% available.
In the future, all firms should be asked to provide this level of detail.

Score 95
(100-0)

97.25
1

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Environmental Consulting & Technology, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Background provided
Restated what they knew about County's CUP requirements without demonstrating
in-depth research or significant effort.

Score 65
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Demonstrated experience but didn't seem to focus on our area of need.

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

New Smyrna Beach, various businesses – not very strong here.

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

50%-60% overall, no detail for PM vs. others.

Score 90
(100-0)

72.0
~~89~~

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hartman & Associates, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

This approach (at 3pgs) was far ~~more~~ more brief than some others. In my opinion, it presented what I would consider the "political strategy" which is perhaps where we may end up. Considerable thought went into it and ideas were clearly laid out. The technical end should have been more substantial.

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

20+ yrs. Professional Geologist
Overall, excellent qualifications.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Palm Bay (brackish experience which may come in handy for us)
Clermont, Port. St. Lucie, Naples, Lakeland

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

30-40% available overall, no PM detail

Score 85
(100-0)

88.25
4

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Good research, well thought out and lucidly presented. Well balanced and insightful.
Remarkably the ONLY consultant to mention the financial aspect and opportunity for grant monies.
Overall, the second best approach and much better than most.

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Lots of experience
Always a little troubling to see a Vice President listed as the project manager. Who would really be performing the majority of work.
Why wasn't Dan Schmidt listed on project team - he has lots of SC exp.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Broward Co., Ft Lauderdale

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

40-50% availability, no detail

Score 90
(100-0)

91.0
2

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PBS&J, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Restated history of CUP process -- why? we already know this. Overall, I was disappointed by this approach. Frankly, it didn't seem adequately aggressive. Are we going to actively question some of the District's false assumptions with no basis in scientific fact?
Does subconsultant HGL have a conflict of interest? Open work w/ SJRWMD?

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

~~Highly~~ Highly qualified given their experience on the CUP

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Seminole County - PBS&J would be impossible to top in this category.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

20-30% shown availability was fairly low, no detail provided for PM workload

Score 80
(100-0)

86.75

5

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Reiss Environmental, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Very good analysis. Well thought out technical approach

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Highly qualified personnel, several PhDs

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Palm Beach Co., Tiger Bay

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

40% - 50% available

Score 90
(100-0)

88.75
3

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Sarah M. Whitaker, P.G.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Basic approach and demonstrated knowledge of District inner workings
Good. Thoughtful

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Extremely qualified.

Score 95
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Polk Co., various cities.

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

50%+. Given the complexity and volume of work required to accomplish
the County's goals, Sarah should have teamed up with a consultant
with greater staff resources.

Score 75
(100-0)

80.25

6

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Water & Air Research, Inc.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Jeffrey F. Thompson

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Some research but not an impressive volume. Approach was not structured well enough to determine exactly what would be done and how it would be done.

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Good qualifications

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Tangan Bay Water

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

25-30% A little low.

Score 75
(100-0)

77.25

8

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Sarah M. Whitaker, P.G.

8

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H. Sipes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Good approach consumptive use permitting, generally. Not much discussion of SDWA specific issues. Excellent understanding of SDWA permitting requirements and issues.

No mention of Subsoil Water permitting provisions issue.

Score 85
(100-0)

38.25

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Highly qualified for this scope. Significant relative experience. Valuable contacts and experience with regulatory authorities.

Maybe a little weak in staff resources & their availability is a concern.

Score 92
(100-0)

18.4

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Good recent experience with Park County and City of Minneola. Other numerous clients listed with services relevant to this scope.

Score 89
(100-0)

22.25

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Workload availability is questionable - small staff may be a problem in ability to perform.

Score 95
(100-0)

9.5

88.4

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

5

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Reiss Environmental

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H. Sykes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Good understanding of Pom. Co.'s recent cur efforts. Appears to have done research into County's water resource availability and needs.
Recognition of county's resource issues, especially surface water treatment

Score 96
(100-0)

43.2

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Team members are qualified based on listed experience with water resource issues of similar scope and with multiple water management districts. However, experience listed on resumes represent a majority of experience with water treatment design projects

Score 90
(100-0)

18.0

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Palm Beach Co - Titus Bay - Broward Co - The Water Auth.
Excellent ground water modeling experience.

Score 90
(100-0)

22.5

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Acceptable

Score 100
(100-0)

10
93.7

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Connect Consulting ①

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H. Sipes

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

20 yr water CUP development.
Avoidance strategies -
Revisions per capita cell as a major problem to be resolved
Cumulative impacts resolution strategy - Interim measures discussion
Excellent presentation - Address all major water issues

Score 98 44.1
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Intimate knowledge of Sem Co. CUP and water resource issues
Ch. Hill strong on water, water quality & resource issues
Excellent team - Strong team

Score 98 19.6
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Strong on Sem. Co. projects.
St. Augustine } similar issues to Sem. Co.
Palm Coast } similar issues to Sem. Co.
Chulita }

Score 95 23.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Sufficient personnel to perform

Score 100 10
(100-0)

97.45

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PBS & J (3)

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H. Sipes

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Understands complex issues -
Continuity - Optimization
Regional perspective
Good presentation - Discussed the major issues

Score 95 42.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Strong existing resources with hydrogeologist who is
very familiar with the County's water resource issues

Score 97 19.4
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

5em Co. Alt. Springs
Polk County
Neptune Beach
Orange County

Score 95 23.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Sufficient workload availability

Score 100 10
(100-0) 95.9

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

6

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HAZEN & SAWYER

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H. Sydes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Good report - Good understanding of issue.
Innovation of CUP -
Consumptive Use Perm approach
Repeal of disjunct RWDs
RWD - Artificial water requirements

Score 95 42.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Strong team - numerous qualified personnel.
Several Ph.D's. -
History of office from Central Fla. (Sanibel) is a major problem.

Score 90 18.0
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

St Landeade - Broward County - Miramar
Plantation - Pompano Beach - Collier County -
Good experience although in a different ward

Score 90 22.5
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Sufficient workforce available

Score 100 10
(100-0)

93.25

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

4

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H S JPS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

General approach to CUP application following WMD criteria
Watershed planning influence
Historical data consistent - modeling - lake levels - WQET
Good understanding of CUP issues, plants, curbs etc. - Good presentation

Score 93
(100-0)

41.85

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Strong team w/ several P&E
Strong proj managers with excellent team proposed
Strong ASR experience

Score 96
(100-0)

19.2

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

St John's Co - Indian River Co
Atlant Beach
Royal Palm Beach
Several similar projects in STREAMD area

Score 93
(100-0)

23.25

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

50% current workload availability

Score 100
(100-0)

10
94.3

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: ECT

9

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H. Sipes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

General / generic approach.
No specific ISSAIP discussed related to Perm Co. CUP process.
Good understanding of CUP process.
Familiarity of CUP criteria

Score 85
(100-0)

38.25

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Project manager is PG - good
Several PG & RPET on proj. team
Good experience - got more on the private side &
small scale projects.

Score 89
(100-0)

17.8

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

New Smyrna Beach - well Pred appn - LaFarge - CUP
several private corp. water resource projects
Minimal public entity projects & small scale projects

Score 88
(100-0)

22.0

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

sufficient workload availability

Score 100
(100-0)

10

88.05

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Water & Air Research, Inc

①

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: H. Sykes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Reviewed Sem. Co. CUP's, mods & applications
Groundwater modeling - data collection for analysis (MODFLOW)
Method Evaluation
Some Sem Co. specific issues identified by generally a generic presentation

Score 88
(100-0)

39.6

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Non local firm - Strong exp. working with SJRWMD
Good mix of P.E.'s & V.E.'s with several Ph.D.'s -
Good team - well qualified - Strong data acquisition

Score 91
(100-0)

18.2

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Tampa Bay Water -
US Army Corp of Engineers
Currently assisting in Sem Co CUP process - New Service Area
Appears to be mostly data gathering type contracts & not CUP application programming

Score 91
(100-0)

22.75

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Sufficient workload available

Score 100
(100-0)

10

90.55

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

2

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Tetra Tech

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: A. Sykes

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Familiar with Sem. Co. ISSUES.
Adaptation -
water demand / per capita issues need to be addressed
Wetlands issues important
Good presentation, however somewhat generic and brief.

Score 96
(100-0)

43.2

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Very strong team
Numerous similar projects.
cur modeling wetlands experience.

Score 97
(100-0)

19.4

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Palm Bay - Clermont - Port St Lucie - Bartow - Naples - Lehigh
Very good & recent exp. with municipalities & counties with similar issues
Seminole County experience with water resource issues & dealing w/ (wmd) (strongly)

Score 84
(100-0)

23.5

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Sufficient workload available

Score 100
(100-0)

10
96.1

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PBS & J

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Formulated a CUP Strategy, has regional perspective on H₂O Supply issues
 * Detailed plan presented for Optimizing GW supplies
 Has history & knowledge of SC systems & supply issues
 * Offers continuity from previous work effort
 No mention of APT's in support of HGL's effort
 Offered short-term strategy for TCUP
 No mention of coordination w/ County's legal staff or outside counsel
 Score 85 38.25
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

* Teamed w/ Hydro Geologic Inc (HGL) - modeling firm & Connect Consulting
 An experienced, highly qualified team w/ prior knowledge of
 County issues & familiarity w/ staff
 Proposed team w/ extensive experience, added statistical expert and
 another PG for oversight of hydrogeo subconsultant.
 Score 85 17
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

SC NWSA CUP renewal, NESA CUP renewal
 Seminole County's CUP Consolidation application & RA1 No.1 response
 Polk County Utilities - CUP renewal in progress, included EMP & HEP
 City of Neptune CUP assistance
 Also, lots of experience w/ SC staff (PW & ES) over last 5 years
 Reclaimed water experience w/ Orange County & Alt. Springs
 Score 80 20
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Project team availability only 10% in 1st Qtr 2005
 but increases to 35% by EOY

Score 75 7.5
 (100-0)

82.75

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Reiss Environmental

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Recommended finding a productive interrelationship w/ agency
 * Included coordinating w/ County legal counsel.
 Identified preset agenda by District may not meet County's goals
 & financial capability
 Stated that Brackish water is a "win-win" solution
 Suggested more model calibration & "sensitivity analysis"
 Recognized effluent as a potential use in reducing
 salt-water intrusion

38.25

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Familiar w/ ECF model & worked w/ SJRWMD in developing MFL's
 Teamed w/ Royal Consulting for permitting & negotiations
 Gary Pevoir w/ b PM
 No PG's identified on Project Team

Score 75 *John*
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Assisted Palm Beach County in obtaining 20 yr CUP
 Performed Integrated GW model & Surface H₂O mode for Tiger Bay
 Subconsultant (Royal) has performed numerous models for South FL clients
 Not a lot of CUP experience, none listed in SJRWMD
 Has also performed a variety of projects w/ SC over past
 5 years.

17.5

Score 70
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Workload availability chart on pg I-7 shows adequate
 labor available increasing as the year progresses.

8.5

Score 85
(100-0)

17.25

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Connect Consulting

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Develop a "viable" 20-year water supply strategy & implement
Excellent cover letter summarizing issues, comprehensive strategy
Teamed w/ CH2MHill, former District consultant, resulting in "insight"
into dealing w/ District's approach, most innovative approach presented
Thorough understanding of County's WTPs, wells & CUPs

- * Recognized deficiencies in ECF regional gw model
- * Would provide seamless transition from current work in progress
- * Strategy included addressing MFL (Sylvan Hk) - Avoidance & Challenge

Score 95
(100-0)

42.75

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Teamed w/ CH2MHill which has working knowledge
of District water supply & water quality issues
Good mix of team members
Existing Connect Consulting team worked on initial CUP Consolidation effort

Score 90
(100-0)

18

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

- Worked w/ SC on several well issues, performed APT
at Markham WTP
- Teamed w/ PBS&J on NWSA CUP renewal, CUP mod etc.
 - Currently teamed w/ PBS&J on CUP Consolidation
 - Worked on Palm Coast CUP, well issues
 - Water supply consultant for City of St. Augustine
 - Provided CUP mod for Florida Water Secs. Chulota system

Score 90
(100-0)

22.5

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Connect Consulting team has 50% availability in 2005
CH2MHill team members have 20 - 70% availability
w/ Matt Alvarez 40%

Score 89
(100-0)

8.9

92.15

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Thorough understanding of issues, status of CUPs
Recommended pre-application mtg, eval. of EN-50's, FLU
Recognized MFL issues, included Table of Lakes in SC, also Springs
Good discussion on wetland impacts w/ categories
No mention of in-house legal assistance or coord w/ County's legal counsel
* Addressed TCUP & interim measures
Recommended frequent coord. & negotiation meetings
* Listed Hot TOPICS

Score 85 38.25
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Full-service firm
Working on contract(s) w/ SJRWMD
Lee Wiseman w/b PM
Working w/ SC on Markham ASR well
* Larry Schwartz - wetlands expert

Score 89 17.8
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Has performed many projects for SC incl. Public Works
Worked for St. Johns County - got 20 yr CUP
Atlantic Beach, FL - 10 year CUP
GW flow modelling for Palm Beach County in support of 20 year WUP
Village of Royal Palm Beach 20 year WUP

Score 87 21.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Key staff immediately available, workload availability
increases after JAN 2005

Score 89 8.9
(100-0)

86.7

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: ECT

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings

80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.

70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is

60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications

Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Recognized key CUP issues such as modelling, MFLs

Approach presented was standard for CUP renewal

No innovative solutions presented.

Provided detailed Budgetary & Cost Control System & Corp. QC prgm.

No mention of working w/ County's legal staff or outside counsel

Score 77
(100-0)

34.65

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Did not propose any subcontractors

Good mix of PEs & PGs on Org chart

Firm has performed extensive work in SFWMP & SWFWMP

Score 70
(100-0)

14

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Cited experience of City of NSB for CUP Mod

A lot of experience w/ private (i.e. commercial, industrial) clients such as Lafarge NA, Duke Energy, power companies, agriculture

Has worked in SC in the past (PS-5150) on projects w/ PW

Score 70
(100-0)

17.5

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Chart on pg I-5 indicates ECT has sufficient availability

Score 80
(100-0)

8

74.15

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hartman & Associates Inc/Tetra Tech

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings

80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.

70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is

60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications

Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Stated that each CUP application is unique
Mentioned feasibility of using brackish water supply & other alt. H₂O
Did not include NWSA in CUP Consolidation
* Suggested meeting w/ SJRWMD Gov. Bd. members & BCC
Mentioned rehydrating wetlands as a possible mitigation strategy
No mention of coordination w/ County's legal staff/outside counsel.

Score 79
(100-0)

35.55

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Full-service firm located in Orlando
PM (Chuck Drake) has 20+ years experience, familiar w/ ESD staff
HAI has performed assisted SC in Alternative water supply issues
C. Walker relationship w/ HAI & select SC staff

Score 79
(100-0)

15.8

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Responsible for CUP renewal for City of Palm Bay
Consolidated two existing CUPs for City of Clermont
Developed 20-year permit for City of Pt. St. Lucie
Also worked on CUPs for City of Bartow, Lakeland & Naples
HAI has recently performed a variety of work w/ SC ESP

Score 85
(100-0)

21.25

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Workload projection chart provided indicates
adequate availability especially later in 2005 thru 2006

Score 80
(100-0)

8

80.6

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hazen & Sawyer

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Recognized that water resource issues are critical to growth mgmt
Stated that "proactive planning" is important wrt alt. H2O supply sources
Recommended comprehensive approach.

Thorough understanding of County's well fields & WTPs (Table 11.1.1)
Goals - minimize per capita, focus on sustainability, address saltwater
No mention of working w/ County's legal staff & outside counsel/inquiries

* Recommended development of CUP team, Financial Score 80 30
* Well design wrt to redevelopment Plan (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Good org. chart w/ mix of PEs & PGs.
Teamed w/ firm of MacVicar, Federico & Lamb - water resource consultant
No. resume for Roecker
H&Z has performed similar work for numerous clients in South FL

Score 79 15.8
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Retained by City of Ft. Lauderdale to expand wellfield & renew CUP
Worked on combining CUPs for Broward County
Also worked w/ City of Miramar, Plantation, Hallandale Bch, & Collier County
H&Z has not performed any work for SC in the past
Lots of work refermed. in SFWMD, No experience in SJRWMD

Score 70 17.5
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Workload chart on pg 1-2 indicates that there is ample
staff availability starting in Feb '05

Score 85 8.5
(100-0)

77.80

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Water & Air Research, Inc

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Too much information on corporation background and not enough on project approach
Approach given was too general, not familiar w/ County work in progress issues etc.
Did mention need for TCUP & APTs
No mention of coordination w/ County's legal staff/ outside counsel

Score 70
(100-0)

31.5

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

GW modeling & well logging for CUP/TCUP FL DEF - Gainesville
Worked on Tampa Bay Water project - wetlands monitoring
Has worked w/ SJRWMD, worked on compliance issues
Performed APT and modeling analysis for Piedmont Farms & FL State Prison

Score 80
(100-0)

16

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Experienced, seasoned (long tenured) staff with a mix of PEs and one PWS and two PGs, one PhD.
No subconsultants listed

Currently assisting SC w/ CUP 8230, Condition 38 - wet lands monitoring & gw level measurements.

Score 70
(100-0)

17.5

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Current workload assessment indicates adequate staff availability ranging from 25 to 40% available thru 2005 - chart provided on Page I-3

Score 80
(100-0)

8

73

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Sarah Whitaker

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: J. Dennis Westrick

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Knowledgeable about new DCA requirements linking development w/ H₂O use.

Mentioned meeting w/ District regarding grant opportunities

Project approach is conventional & thorough.

Proposed preparation of a detailed compliance & water conservation plan.

33.75

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Former SJRWMD supervising hydrogeologist, small two-person firm.

Ms. Whitaker has extensive experience w/ FL hydrogeological issues, CUPs etc.

One subconsultant listed - Mark Kohue - wetlands expert

Provided input on District's Water Supply Plan

As consultant prepared numerous CUP application in SJRWMD

17

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

Currently provided CUP assistance to City of Taravere - CUP mod.

City of Minneola CUP renewal

City of Leesburg - ongoing

Polk County Utilities - subconsultant to PBS & J R Boyle

No previous work w/ SC

20

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Allocated hours and workload availability is

adequate w/ OT and/or additional staff could be hired

Score 75
(100-0)

7.5

78.25

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: SARAH M. WHITAKER P.G.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPH

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

APPROACH IS MOSTLY ORIENTED TOWARDS
MODELING -
LITTLE DISCUSSION ON DEVELOPMENT OF
MITIGATION AND ENGINEERED SOLUTIONS

Score 75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

SARAH APPEARS TO BE A VERY
QUALIFIED P.G.
HOWEVER ENGINEERING SUPPORT FOR
ALTERNATIVES IS LACKING

Score 80
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

2 ~~RECENT~~ PROJECTS LISTED - MUNICIPAL
SEEMS TO BE PROJECT SUPPORT

Score 70
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

MANPOWER PROJECTIONS OR
ADDITIONAL PEOPLE AS NEEDED

Score 85
(100-0)

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: EC&T

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPHE

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

EXTREMELY GENERAL
NO SPECIFICS OR DETAILED HISTORY

Score 78
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

STAFF APPEARS TO BE QUALIFIED
HOWEVER NOT ALL HAVE RESUMES

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

LITTLE MUNICIPAL
INDUSTRY SPECIFIC

Score 70
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

LOOKS FINE
CHART OK
SUBS HIRED AS NEEDED

Score 85
(100-0)

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: WATER & AIR RESEARCH

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Bob Adolphe

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

General description of modeling & other services
Did note M&E's
would challenge district as noted
Few specifics of direct approach

Score 86
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

APPEALS TO BE MORE MONITORING & SCIENTIFIC
RATHER THAN STRONG MIX WITH
ENG ABILITIES - WATER FACILITIES ETC.

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

GOOD MONITORING - SCIENTIFIC
LITTLE MUNICIPAL CUP DEMONSTRATION

Score 70
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

AVAILABILITY - OK

Score 85
(100-0)

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: REISS ENVIRONMENTAL

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPHE

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

GOOD DISCUSSION OF ISSUES
NO CONFLICTS - FIGHT FOR INTERESTS
GOOD MODELING DESCRIPTIONS

Score ~~90~~ 87
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

LOTS OF PROCESS EXPERIENCE
BACKED BY ROYAL ENG.

Score 88
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

STLWMS MODELING & CUP EXPERIENCE
GOOD

Score 85
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

LOOKS SUFFICIENT

Score 85
(100-0)

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CCI

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: B. B. ADAMS

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

GOOD DISCUSSION OF ALL ASPECTS
MITIGATION STRATEGIES
GOOD TRACK RECORD WITH S/C

Score 88
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

WORKING SOLID - CUP EXPERIENCE
PARTNER W/ CH2M HILL - GOOD QUALS

Score 88
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

CUP EXPERIENCE (MUNICIPAL) IN STRAWND
PREVIOUS S/C

Score 86
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

CHART OK

Score 85
(100-0)

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: HAI

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPH

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF HISTORY AT S/C
OVERVIEW OF MITIGATION OPTIONS
DISCUSSED ALTERNATIVE WATER
DISCUSSED POLITICAL APPROACH

Score 89
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

PAST ASSOCIATIONS WITH STRAWND STAFF
WATER TREATMENT TALENT

Score 89
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

MUNICIPAL & CUP RENEWAL EXP
STRWMD - YES!

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

GOOD CHART

Score 85
(100-0)

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: ~~XXXXXXXXXX~~ CDM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: BOB ADOLPHE

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

TECHNICAL APPROACH ADDRESSED CUR IN DETAIL
REASON FOR HOLDING BACK ON APPLICATION DATA
HOT-ISSUES WAS GOOD
SPECIFICS ON MODELING

Score 89
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

VERY QUALIFIED TEAM
ENR & SCIENTIFIC

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

STRONG BACKGROUNDS WITH EXPERIENCE
IN STURMO
MUNICIPAL EXPERIENCE
MODELING STRENGTHS STURMO - yes!

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

CHART GOOD

Score 85
(100-0)

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PBS, J

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Bob Adolphe

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

VERY ~~THOROUGH~~ THOROUGH APPROACH
STRATEGY WAS DETAILED
KNOWLEDGE OF LEGAL TEAM
ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS TO BACK MODELING
IS THERE A STRAWND CONFLICT?

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

GOOD MIX OF TALENT - VERY QUALIFIED
ADDED EXTRA MODELING BUT DON'T WANT
TO UNDERSTATE MODELING TEAM ON BOARD
DON'T WANT "TOO MANY COOKS IN THE KITCHEN"
NEED TO BE SENSITIVE TO BUDGET

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

GOOD HISTORY OF CURRENT PROJECTS
SIMILAR CUP MUNICIPAL EXPERIENCE
PREVIOUS SIC

Score 90
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

SATISFACTORY

Score 85
(100-0)

①

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: CONNECT CONSULTING INC / CH₂M HILL

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Grady Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Very comprehensive, multiple step by step to
the issues to complete issuance of 20yr permit.
Potential approach to work with District to update
MONRAC -

Score 89 40.05
 (100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Very Knowledgeable staff. 30 yrs MONRAC
experience. 19 STAFF worked on
previous TEAM.

Score 82 16.40
 (100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

ONLY IDENTIFIED 3 NON county projects
Firm has worked on numerous CUP TRAIL
PROJECTS.

Score 80 20.00
 (100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Firm INDICATES sufficient staff to
support projects

Score 75 7.5
 (100-0)
83.95

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Hazen & Sawyer

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Basic approach to solution Reviewed Master Plan
Feels a CUP TEAM approach is way to go. Realize extensive
groundwater ~~mass~~ monitoring network needed. Feel cheap
groundwater the way to go - Potential use of GRANT MONEY
AWARE OF LK05ELVAM MFL ISSUES.

Score 78 35.1
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

TWO MEMBERS OUTSTANDING - HELPED REV. CONSUMPTIVE USE
REGULATION IN STATE OF FLORIDA.

Score 85 17
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%) SFWMD

LOOKS LIKE ALL work in ~~SFWMD~~ consolidated two
CUP's into one for Broward county

Score 78 19.5
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

They show sufficient staff to support
efforts

Score ~~90~~^{for} 75 7.5
(100-0) 79.1

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Tetra Tech INC. (Hartman + Assoc.)

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Missed NW as part of project. Several short on
MODELING EFFORTS - WOULD USE ANY RELEVANT LITERATURE
H₂O USE & SIZ. GOOD ON ADDRESSING MODEL CONCERNS
Did not provide detail on all aspects of project. i.e. H₂O CONSUM.
Good strength on looking & Rehydration of potentially impacted
wetlands. USE OF COUNTY COMMISSIONS to meet with
RISULT COMMISSION - (Legislators)

Score 79 35.55
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Have done two consolidation efforts. STAFF HAVE
THE KNOWLEDGE AND INDICATES CONTACTS WITHIN SJRWMD
to get project done

Score 80 16
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

INDICATE TWO CONSOLIDATION EFFORTS. (CLEMONT) (MADISON COUNTY)
A couple of team key OPS with other consulting services

Score 79 19.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Firm has provided sufficient detail to
INDICATE they have ~~the~~ resources to complete
the tasks.

Score 75 7.5
(100-0)
78.8

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: PBS+J

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Very comprehensive approach. Firm has history with this specific project. Since modeling is STRWMD's tool for control Firm has pulled out team very knowledgeable firms to help in that effort.

Score 80 36.0
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Firm HAS shown Personnel are well qualified to meet our needs.

Score 78 15.6
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

NO CONSOLIDATION OF CUP'S IDENTIFIED. TRADITIONAL CUP WORK IDENTIFIED AND ONE INNOVATIVE TECHNIQUE WITH ALTAMUNTA SPRINGS IDENTIFIED

Score 78 19.5
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Firm has provided sufficient detail indicating the resources will be made available

Score 75 7.5
(100-0) 28.6

3

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Reiss Environmental

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

HAS A GOOD BASIC IDEA OF WHAT WE WANT. ON TRACK
WITH USE OF LEGAL COUNSEL. ON TOP OF THE NEEDED
TO USE EFFICIENT TO FIELD RESULTS WITH MINIMALS +
EXTEND BUDGETARY SOURCES. GOOD USE OF WORKS ON
SHOWING "STAFF AGENDA" NOT INDEPENDENT GOVERNING STAFF

Score 78
(100-0)

35.1

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

STRONG MODELING ABILITY - NOT SO STRONG IN
THE ACTUAL CUP APPLICATION PROCESS. LOTS OF SUPPORT
BUT NOT TURN KEY PROJECTS

Score 77
(100-0)

15.4

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

NO CONSOLIDATION PROJECTS AGAIN LOTS OF
SUPPORT NO TURN KEY PROJECTS - STRONG
MODELING EFFORT.

Score 76
(100-0)

19.0

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

FIRM HAS SHOWN THEY HAVE SUFFICIENT
RESOURCES TO COMPLETE TASKS

Score 75
(100-0)

7.5
77

6

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: WATER + AIR RESEARCH

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:

- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
- 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
- 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
- 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
- Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

FIRM SHOWS BASIC KNOWLEDGE OF REQUIREMENTS AND PROVIDED THE PROCESS TO BE FOLLOWED TO GET WORK DONE. GOOD INPUT ON USE OF WELL ALLOCATIONS TO MEET WITHDRAWAL NEEDS. NO ALTERNATIVES TO GROUNDWATER SOURCES MENTIONED.

Score 77 (100-0)

34.65

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

LOTS OF MODERN EXPERIENCE, APT, WELL INSTALLATION: PROPOSAL SEEMS TO INDICATE CUP WITH THE MAJOR WORK THEY DO. NO CONSULTATION CUP WORK INDICATED

Score 78 (100-0)

15.0

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

PROVIDED INFO PRIMARILY ON NEW-CUP ACTIVITIES - WELL + MONITORING WORK MOSTLY.

Score 73 (100-0)

18.25

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

FIRM HAS INDICATED SUFFICIENT RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO SUPPORT PROJECT.

Score 75 (100-0)

7.5 / 20 = 76.3

107

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: COM

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Basic approach given. Have a good handle on the
CUP process. NO real innovations provided
They feel consolidation of all permits should be
pursued.

Score 75 33.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

MR. WISEMAN HAS A VERY STRONG BACKGROUND
MUNICIPALITY experience. Rest of staff adequate

Score 80 16.00
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

COM SHOWED THEY CAN + know how to
get CUPS.

Score 75 18.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

The firm provided data showing they
have sufficient resources to complete support.

Score 75 7.5
(100-0) 76

PS-5172-04/AJR – Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: ECT

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
90 – 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
80 – 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
70 – 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
60 – 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

Very informative on what they can do. No specifics given on our needs to consolidate our CUP's. Did not see any innovative solutions for us.

Score 75 33.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

Provided sufficient detail on personnel - lots of agricultural experience. Not a lot of municipal work.

Score 75 15.00
(100-0)

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

NO CONSOLIDATION EXPERIENCE, HAVE WORKED WITH CITIES TO MODIFY/INCREASE ALLOCATION

Score 75 18.75
(100-0)

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

Firm provided sufficient detail indicating resources available.

Score 75 7.5
(100-0) 75

* ADDENDUM #1 + #2 submitted in previous issues with others?

PS-5172-04/AJR - Consumptive Use Permit

SUBMITTAL COMPANY NAME: Sarah M. Whitaker, P.G.

QUALIFICATION COMMITTEE MEMBER: Gary Lee Rudolph

- INSTRUCTIONS: Score each criterion from 1 to 100 based on the following general guidelines:
- 90 - 100 Outstanding, out-of-the-box, Innovative, Cost/Time Savings
 - 80 - 89 Excellent, Very Good, Solid in all respects.
 - 70 - 79 Good, No major weaknesses, Fully Acceptable as is
 - 60 - 69 Marginal, Weak, Workable but needs clarifications
 - Below 60 Unacceptable, Needs major help to be acceptable

Describe strengths, weaknesses and deficiencies to support your assessment.

Criteria: Approach to Project/ Innovative Solutions (45%)

HAS A GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF SCOPE, WORKED @ THE DISTRICT 6 years ago so she knows the ropes. Lengthy list of the process to follow to get the work done. NO SPECIAL INNOVATIVE SOLUTIONS PROVIDED.

Score 73 (100-0) 32.85

Criteria: Qualifications of Proposed Personnel and Firm (20%)

FIRM IS QUALIFIED TO PROVIDE SERVICES. A little concern on use of contracted support. Comment in workup but will get resources if needed + seems like wants to use county staff heavily.

Score 74 (100-0) 14.8

Criteria: Similar Recent Project Experience (25%)

ONE TURN KEY project mentioned lots of consultant support work. Good Regulatory experience. No consolidation experience

Score 78 (100-0) 19.5

Criteria: Workload/Ability to Perform (10%)

FIRM HAS INDICATED SUFFICIENT TIME IS AVAILABLE TO PERFORM TASKS. OUTSIDE SUPPORT WILL BE HIRED IF NECESSARY

Score 73 (100-0) 7.3

Work with stream applicants @ same time.

74.45

CONSULTANT SERVICES AGREEMENT (PS-5172-04/AJR)
CONSUMPTIVE USE PERMIT ASSISTANCE

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this _____ day of _____, 20____, by and between **PBS&J, Inc.**, duly authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida, whose address is 482 S. Keller Rd., Orlando, Florida 32810-6101, hereinafter called the "CONSULTANT" and **SEMINOLE COUNTY**, a political subdivision of the State of Florida, whose address is Seminole County Services Building, 1101 East First Street, Sanford, Florida 32771, hereinafter called the "COUNTY".

W I T N E S S E T H:

WHEREAS, the COUNTY desires to retain the services of a competent and qualified consultant to provide professional assistance with the preparation of consumptive use permits (CUPs) and related negotiations with the St. Johns River Water Management District in Seminole County; and

WHEREAS, the COUNTY has requested and received expressions of interest for the retention of services of consultants; and

WHEREAS, the CONSULTANT is competent and qualified to furnish consulting services to the COUNTY and desires to provide professional services according to the terms and conditions stated herein,

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual understandings and covenants set forth herein, the COUNTY and the CONSULTANT agree as follows:

SECTION 1. SERVICES. The COUNTY does hereby retain the CONSULTANT to furnish professional services and perform those tasks as further described in the Scope of Services attached hereto as Exhibit "A" and made a part hereof. Required services shall be specifically enumerated, described and depicted in the Work Orders authorizing performance of the specific project, task or study. This Agreement

standing alone does not authorize the performance of any work or require the COUNTY to place any orders for work.

SECTION 2. TERM. This Agreement shall take effect on the date of its execution by the COUNTY and shall run for a period of three (3) years and, at the sole option of COUNTY, may be renewed for two (2) successive periods not to exceed one (1) year each. Expiration of the term of this Agreement shall have no effect upon Work Orders issued pursuant to this Agreement and prior to the expiration date. Obligations entered therein by both parties shall remain in effect until completion of the work authorized by the Work Order.

SECTION 3. AUTHORIZATION FOR SERVICES. Authorization for performance of professional services by the CONSULTANT under this Agreement shall be in the form of written Work Orders issued and executed by the COUNTY and signed by the CONSULTANT. A sample Work Order is attached hereto as Exhibit "B". Each Work Order shall describe the services required, state the dates for commencement and completion of work and establish the amount and method of payment. The Work Orders will be issued under and shall incorporate the terms of this Agreement. The COUNTY makes no covenant or promise as to the number of available projects, nor that, the CONSULTANT will perform any project for the COUNTY during the life of this Agreement. The COUNTY reserves the right to contract with other parties for the services contemplated by this Agreement when it is determined by the COUNTY to be in the best interest of the COUNTY to do so.

SECTION 4. TIME FOR COMPLETION. The services to be rendered by the CONSULTANT shall be commenced, as specified in such Work Orders as may be issued hereunder, and shall be completed within the time specified therein. In the event the COUNTY determines that significant benefits would accrue from expediting an otherwise established time

schedule for completion of services under a given Work Order, that Work Order may include a negotiated schedule of incentives based on time savings.

SECTION 5. COMPENSATION. The COUNTY agrees to compensate the CONSULTANT for the professional services called for under this Agreement on either a "Fixed Fee" basis or on a "Time Basis Method". If a Work Order is issued under a "Time Basis Method," then CONSULTANT shall be compensated in accordance with the rate schedule attached as Exhibit "C". If a Work Order is issued for a "Fixed Fee Basis," then the applicable Work Order Fixed Fee amount shall include any and all reimbursable expenses. Annual compensation paid to the CONSULTANT shall not exceed COUNTY budgeted amounts for the CONSULTANT'S services.

SECTION 6. REIMBURSABLE EXPENSES. If a Work Order is issued on a "Time Basis Method," then reimbursable expenses are in addition to the hourly rates. Reimbursable expenses are subject to the applicable "Not-to-Exceed" or "Limitation of Funds" amount set forth in the Work Order. Reimbursable expenses may include actual expenditures made by the CONSULTANT, his employees or his professional associates in the interest of the Project for the expenses listed in the following paragraphs:

(a) Expenses of transportation, when traveling in connection with the Project, based on Sections 112.061(7) and (8), Florida Statutes, or their successor; long distance calls and telegrams; and fees paid for securing approval of authorities having jurisdiction over the Project.

(b) Expense of reproductions, postage and handling of drawings and specifications.

(c) If authorized in writing in advance by the COUNTY, the cost of other expenditures made by the CONSULTANT in the interest of the Project.

SECTION 7. PAYMENT AND BILLING.

(a) If the Scope of Services required to be performed by a Work Order is clearly defined, the Work Order shall be issued on a "Fixed Fee" basis. The CONSULTANT shall perform all work required by the Work Order but, in no event, shall the CONSULTANT be paid more than the negotiated Fixed Fee amount stated therein.

(b) If the Scope of Services is not clearly defined, the Work Order may be issued on a "Time Basis Method" and contain a Not-to Exceed amount. If a Not-to-Exceed amount is provided, the CONSULTANT shall perform all work required by the Work Order; but, in no event, shall the CONSULTANT be paid more than the Not-to-Exceed amount specified in the applicable Work Order.

(c) If the Scope of Services is not clearly defined, the Work Order may be issued on a "Time Basis Method" and contain a Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT is not authorized to exceed that amount without the prior written approval of the COUNTY. Said approval, if given by the COUNTY, shall indicate a new Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT shall advise the COUNTY whenever the CONSULTANT has incurred expenses on any Work Order that equals or exceeds eighty percent (80%) of the Limitation of Funds amount.

(d) For Work Orders issued on a "Fixed Fee Basis," the CONSULTANT may invoice the amount due based on the percentage of total Work Order services actually performed and completed; but, in no event, shall the invoice amount exceed a percentage of the Fixed Fee amount equal to a percentage of the total services actually completed. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT ninety percent (90%) of the approved amount on Work Orders issued on a "Fixed Fee Basis".

(e) For Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Not-to-Exceed amount, the CONSULTANT may invoice the amount due for actual

work hours performed but, in no event, shall the invoice amount exceed a percentage of the Not-to-Exceed amount equal to a percentage of the total services actually completed. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT ninety percent (90%) of the approved amount on Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Not-to-Exceed amount.

(f) Each Work Order issued on a "Fixed Fee Basis" or "Time Basis Method" with a Not-to-Exceed amount shall be treated separately for retainage purposes. If the COUNTY determines that work is substantially complete and the amount retained is considered to be in excess, the COUNTY may, at its sole and absolute discretion, release the retainage or any portion thereof.

(g) For Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Limitation of Funds amount, the CONSULTANT may invoice the amount due for services actually performed and completed. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT one hundred percent (100%) of the approved amount on Work Orders issued on a "Time Basis Method" with a Limitation of Funds amount.

(h) Payments shall be made by the COUNTY to the CONSULTANT when requested as work progresses for services furnished, but not more than once monthly. Each Work Order shall be invoiced separately. CONSULTANT shall render to COUNTY, at the close of each calendar month, an itemized invoice properly dated, describing any services rendered, the cost of the services, the name and address of the CONSULTANT, Work Order Number, Contract Number and all other information required by this Agreement.

The original invoice shall be sent to:

Director of County Finance
Seminole County Board of County Commissioners
Post Office Box 8080
Sanford, Florida 32772

A duplicate copy of the invoice shall be sent to:

Environmental Services
520 W. Lake Mary Blvd., Suite 200
Sanford, Florida 32773

(i) Payment shall be made after review and approval by COUNTY within thirty (30) days of receipt of a proper invoice from the CONSULTANT.

SECTION 8. GENERAL TERMS OF PAYMENT AND BILLING.

(a) Upon satisfactory completion of work required hereunder and, upon acceptance of the work by the COUNTY, the CONSULTANT may invoice the COUNTY for the full amount of compensation provided for under the terms of this Agreement including any retainage and less any amount already paid by the COUNTY. The COUNTY shall pay the CONSULTANT within thirty (30) days of receipt of proper invoice.

(b) The COUNTY may perform or have performed an audit of the records of the CONSULTANT after final payment to support final payment hereunder. This audit would be performed at a time mutually agreeable to the CONSULTANT and the COUNTY subsequent to the close of the final fiscal period in which the last work is performed. Total compensation to the CONSULTANT may be determined subsequent to an audit as provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section, and the total compensation so determined shall be used to calculate final payment to the CONSULTANT. Conduct of this audit shall not delay final payment as provided by subsection (a) of this Section.

(c) In addition to the above, if federal funds are used for any work under the Agreement, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access to any books, documents, papers, and records, of the CONSULTANT which are directly pertinent to work performed under this Agreement for purposes of making audit, examination, excerpts and transcriptions.

(d) The CONSULTANT agrees to maintain all books, documents, papers, accounting records and other evidences pertaining to work performed under this Agreement in such a manner as will readily conform to the terms of this Agreement and to make such materials available at the CONSULTANT'S office at all reasonable times during the Agreement period and for five (5) years from the date of final payment under the contract for audit or inspection as provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of this Section.

(e) In the event any audit or inspection conducted after final payment, but within the period provided in paragraph (d) of this Section reveals any overpayment by the COUNTY under the terms of the Agreement, the CONSULTANT shall refund such overpayment to the COUNTY within thirty (30) days of notice by the COUNTY.

SECTION 9. RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE CONSULTANT.

(a) The CONSULTANT shall be responsible for the professional quality, technical accuracy, competence, methodology, accuracy and the coordination of all of the following which are listed for illustration purposes and not as a limitation: documents, analysis, reports, data, plans, plats, maps, surveys, specifications, and any and all other services of whatever type or nature furnished by the CONSULTANT under this Agreement. The CONSULTANT shall, without additional compensation, correct or revise any errors or deficiencies in his plans, analysis, data, reports, designs, drawings, specifications, and any and all other services of whatever type or nature.

(b) Neither the COUNTY'S review, approval or acceptance of, nor payment for, any of the services required shall be construed to operate as a waiver of any rights under this Agreement nor of any cause of action arising out of the performance of this Agreement and the CONSULTANT shall be and always remain liable to the COUNTY in accordance

with applicable law for any and all damages to the COUNTY caused by the CONSULTANT'S negligent or wrongful performance of any of the services furnished under this Agreement.

(c) The CONSULTANT shall, prior to commencing services pursuant to this Agreement, execute the Truth in Negotiations Certificate attached to this Agreement as Exhibit "D".

SECTION 10. OWNERSHIP OF DOCUMENTS. All deliverable analysis, reference data, survey data, plans and reports or any other form of written instrument or document that may result from the CONSULTANT'S services or have been created during the course of the CONSULTANT'S performance under this Agreement shall become the property of the COUNTY after final payment is made to the CONSULTANT.

SECTION 11. TERMINATION.

(a) The COUNTY may, by written notice to the CONSULTANT terminate this Agreement or any Work Order issued hereunder, in whole or in part, at any time, either for the COUNTY'S convenience or because of the failure of the CONSULTANT to fulfill its Agreement obligations. Upon receipt of such notice, the CONSULTANT shall:

(1) immediately discontinue all services affected unless the notice directs otherwise, and

(2) deliver to the COUNTY all data, drawings, specifications, reports, estimates, summaries, and any and all such other information and materials of whatever type or nature as may have been accumulated by the CONSULTANT in performing this Agreement, whether completed or in process.

(b) If the termination is for the convenience of the COUNTY, the CONSULTANT shall be paid compensation for services performed to the date of termination. If this Agreement calls for the payment based on a Fixed Fee amount, the CONSULTANT shall be paid no more than a percentage

of the Fixed Fee amount equivalent to the percentage of the completion of work, as determined solely and conclusively by the COUNTY, contemplated by this Agreement.

(c) If the termination is due to the failure of the CONSULTANT to fulfill its Agreement obligations, the COUNTY may take over the work and prosecute the same to completion by other Agreements or otherwise. In such case, the CONSULTANT shall be liable to the COUNTY for all reasonable additional costs occasioned to the COUNTY thereby. The CONSULTANT shall not be liable for such additional costs if the failure to perform the Agreement arises without any fault or negligence of the CONSULTANT; provided, however, that the CONSULTANT shall be responsible and liable for the actions of its subcontractors, agents, employees and persons and entities of a similar type or nature. Such causes may include acts of God or of the public enemy, acts of the COUNTY in either its sovereign or contractual capacity, fires, floods, epidemics, quarantine restrictions, strikes, freight embargoes, and unusually severe weather; but, in every case, the failure to perform must be beyond the control and without any fault or negligence of the CONSULTANT.

(d) If, after notice of termination for failure to fulfill its Agreement obligations, it is determined that the CONSULTANT had not so failed, the termination shall be conclusively deemed to have been effected for the convenience of the COUNTY. In such event, adjustment in the Agreement price shall be made as provided in subsection (b) of this Section.

(e) The rights and remedies of the COUNTY provided for in this Section are in addition and supplemental to any and all other rights and remedies provided by law or under this Agreement.

SECTION 12. AGREEMENT AND WORK ORDER IN CONFLICT. Whenever the terms of this Agreement conflict with any Work Order issued pursuant to

it, the Agreement shall prevail.

SECTION 13. EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYMENT. The CONSULTANT agrees that it will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment for work under this Agreement because of race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin and will take steps to ensure that applicants are employed, and employees are treated during employment, without regard to race, color, religion, sex, age, disability, or national origin. This provision shall include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer; recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship.

SECTION 14. NO CONTINGENT FEES. The CONSULTANT warrants that it has not employed or retained any company or person, other than a bona fide employee working solely for the CONSULTANT to solicit or secure this Agreement and that it has not paid or agreed to pay any person, company, corporation, individual or firm, other than a bona fide employee working solely for the CONSULTANT, any fee, commission, percentage, gift, or other consideration contingent upon or resulting from award or making of this Agreement. For the breach or violation of this provision, the COUNTY shall have the right to terminate the Agreement at its sole discretion, without liability and to deduct from the Agreement price, or otherwise recover, the full amount of such fee, commission, percentage, gift, or consideration.

SECTION 15. CONFLICT OF INTEREST.

(a) The CONSULTANT agrees that it will not contract for or accept employment for the performance of any work or service with any individual, business, corporation or government unit that would create a conflict of interest in the performance of its obligations pursuant to

this Agreement with the COUNTY.

(b) The CONSULTANT agrees that it will neither take any action nor engage in any conduct that would cause any COUNTY employee to violate the provisions of Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, relating to ethics in government.

(c) In the event that CONSULTANT causes or in any way promotes or encourages a COUNTY officer, employee, or agent to violate Chapter 112, Florida Statutes, the COUNTY shall have the right to terminate this Agreement.

SECTION 16. ASSIGNMENT. This Agreement, or any interest herein, shall not be assigned, transferred, or otherwise encumbered, under any circumstances, by the parties hereto without prior written consent of the other party and in such cases only by a document of equal dignity herewith.

SECTION 17. SUBCONTRACTORS. In the event that the CONSULTANT, during the course of the work under this Agreement, requires the services of any subcontractors or other professional associates in connection with services covered by this Agreement, the CONSULTANT must first secure the prior express written approval of the COUNTY. If subcontractors or other professional associates are required in connection with the services covered by this Agreement, CONSULTANT shall remain fully responsible for the services of subcontractors or other professional associates.

SECTION 18. INDEMNIFICATION OF COUNTY. The CONSULTANT agrees to hold harmless, replace, and indemnify the COUNTY, its commissioners, officers, and employees against any and all damages or lawsuits for damages to the extent caused by the negligent, reckless, or intentionally wrongful provision of services hereunder by the CONSULTANT.

SECTION 19. INSURANCE.

(a) GENERAL. The CONSULTANT shall at the CONSULTANT'S own cost, procure the insurance required under this Section.

(1) The CONSULTANT shall furnish the COUNTY with a Certificate of Insurance signed by an authorized representative of the insurer evidencing the insurance required by this Section (Professional Liability, Workers' Compensation/Employer's Liability and Commercial General Liability). The COUNTY, its officials, officers, and employees shall be named additional insured under the Commercial General Liability policy. The Certificate of Insurance shall provide that the COUNTY shall be given not less than thirty (30) days written notice prior to the cancellation or restriction of coverage. Until such time as the insurance is no longer required to be maintained by the CONSULTANT, the CONSULTANT shall provide the COUNTY with a renewal or replacement Certificate of Insurance not less than thirty (30) days before expiration or replacement of the insurance for which a previous certificate has been provided.

(2) The Certificate shall contain a statement that it is being provided in accordance with the Agreement and that the insurance is in full compliance with the requirements of the Agreement. In lieu of the statement on the Certificate, the CONSULTANT shall, at the option of the COUNTY submit a sworn, notarized statement from an authorized representative of the insurer that the Certificate is being provided in accordance with the Agreement and that the insurance is in full compliance with the requirements of the Agreement. **The Certificate shall have this Agreement number clearly marked on its face.**

(3) In addition to providing the Certificate of Insurance, if required by the COUNTY, the CONSULTANT shall, within thirty (30) days after receipt of the request, provide the COUNTY with a certified copy

of each of the policies of insurance providing the coverage required by this Section.

(4) Neither approval by the COUNTY nor failure to disapprove the insurance furnished by a CONSULTANT shall relieve the CONSULTANT of the CONSULTANT'S full responsibility for performance of any obligation including CONSULTANT indemnification of COUNTY under this Agreement.

(b) INSURANCE COMPANY REQUIREMENTS. Insurance companies providing the insurance under this Agreement must meet the following requirements:

(1) Companies issuing policies other than Workers' Compensation, must be authorized to conduct business in the State of Florida and prove same by maintaining Certificates of Authority issued to the companies by the Department of Insurance of the State of Florida. Policies for Workers' Compensation may be issued by companies authorized as a group self-insurer by Section 440.57, Florida Statutes.

(2) In addition, such companies other than those authorized by Section 440.57, Florida Statutes, shall have and maintain a Best's Rating of "A" or better and a Financial Size Category of "VII" or better according to A.M. Best Company.

(3) If, during the period which an insurance company is providing the insurance coverage required by this Agreement, an insurance company shall: 1) lose its Certificate of Authority, 2) no longer comply with Section 440.57, Florida Statutes, or 3) fail to maintain the requisite Best's Rating and Financial Size Category, the CONSULTANT shall, as soon as the CONSULTANT has knowledge of any such circumstance, immediately notify the COUNTY and immediately replace the insurance coverage provided by the insurance company with a different insurance company meeting the requirements of this Agreement. Until such time as

the CONSULTANT has replaced the unacceptable insurer with an insurer acceptable to the COUNTY the CONSULTANT shall be deemed to be in default of this Agreement.

(c) SPECIFICATIONS. Without limiting any of the other obligations or liability of the CONSULTANT, the CONSULTANT shall, at the CONSULTANT'S sole expense, procure, maintain and keep in force amounts and types of insurance conforming to the minimum requirements set forth in this subsection. Except as otherwise specified in the Agreement, the insurance shall become effective prior to the commencement of work by the CONSULTANT and shall be maintained in force until the Agreement completion date. The amounts and types of insurance shall conform to the following minimum requirements.

(1) Workers' Compensation/Employer's Liability.

(A) The CONSULTANT'S insurance shall cover the CONSULTANT for liability which would be covered by the latest edition of the standard Workers' Compensation Policy, as filed for use in Florida by the National Council on Compensation Insurance, without restrictive endorsements. The CONSULTANT will also be responsible for procuring proper proof of coverage from its subcontractors of every tier for liability which is a result of a Workers' Compensation injury to the subcontractor's employees. The minimum required limits to be provided by both the CONSULTANT and its subcontractors are outlined in subsection (c) below. In addition to coverage for the Florida Workers' Compensation Act, where appropriate, coverage is to be included for the United States Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, Federal Employers' Liability Act and any other applicable federal or state law.

(B) Subject to the restrictions of coverage found in the standard Workers' Compensation Policy, there shall be no maximum limit on the amount of coverage for liability imposed by the Florida

Workers' Compensation Act, the United States Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, or any other coverage customarily insured under Part One of the standard Workers' Compensation Policy.

(C) The minimum amount of coverage under Part Two of the standard Workers' Compensation Policy shall be:

\$ 500,000.00	(Each Accident)
\$1,000,000.00	(Disease-Policy Limit)
\$ 500,000.00	(Disease-Each Employee)

(2) Commercial General Liability.

(A) The CONSULTANT'S insurance shall cover the CONSULTANT for those sources of liability which would be covered by the latest edition of the standard Commercial General Liability Coverage Form (ISO Form CG 00 01), as filed for use in the State of Florida by the Insurance Services Office, without the attachment of restrictive endorsements other than the elimination of Coverage C, Medical Payment and the elimination of coverage for Fire Damage Legal Liability.

(B) The minimum limits to be maintained by the CONSULTANT (inclusive of any amounts provided by an Umbrella or Excess policy) shall be as follows:

	<u>LIMITS</u>
General Aggregate	\$Three (3) Times the Each Occurrence Limit
Personal & Advertising Injury Limit	\$1,000,000.00
Each Occurrence Limit	\$1,000,000.00

(3) Professional Liability Insurance. The CONSULTANT shall carry limits of not less than ONE MILLION AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$1,000,000.00).

(d) COVERAGE. The insurance provided by CONSULTANT pursuant to this Agreement shall apply on a primary basis and any other insurance or self-insurance maintained by the COUNTY or the COUNTY'S officials,

officers, or employees shall be excess of and not contributing with the insurance provided by or on behalf of the CONSULTANT.

(e) OCCURRENCE BASIS. The Workers' Compensation Policy and the Commercial General Liability required by this Agreement shall be provided on an occurrence rather than a claims-made basis. The Professional Liability insurance policy must either be on an occurrence basis, or, if a claims-made basis, the coverage must respond to all claims reported within three (3) years following the period for which coverage is required and which would have been covered had the coverage been on an occurrence basis.

(f) OBLIGATIONS. Compliance with the foregoing insurance requirements shall not relieve the CONSULTANT, its employees or agents of liability from any obligation under a Section or any other portions of this Agreement.

SECTION 20. ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION (ADR).

(a) In the event of a dispute related to any performance or payment obligation arising under this Agreement, the parties agree to exhaust COUNTY ADR procedures prior to filing suit or otherwise pursuing legal remedies. COUNTY ADR procedures for proper invoice and payment disputes are set forth in Section 55.1, "Prompt Payment Procedures," Seminole County Administrative Code. Contract claims include all controversies, except disputes addressed by the "Prompt Payment Procedures," arising under this Agreement with ADR procedures set forth in Section 220.102, "Contract Claims," Seminole County Code.

(b) CONSULTANT agrees that it will file no suit or otherwise pursue legal remedies based on facts or evidentiary materials that were not presented for consideration in the COUNTY ADR procedures set forth in subsection (a) above of which the CONSULTANT had knowledge and failed to present during the COUNTY ADR procedures.

(c) In the event that COUNTY ADR procedures are exhausted and a suit is filed or legal remedies are otherwise pursued, the parties shall exercise best efforts to resolve disputes through voluntary mediation. Mediator selection and the procedures to be employed in voluntary mediation shall be mutually acceptable to the parties. Costs of voluntary mediation shall be shared equally among the parties participating in the mediation.

SECTION 21. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE COUNTY AND THE CONSULTANT.

(a) It is recognized that questions in the day-to-day conduct of performance pursuant to this Agreement will arise. The COUNTY, upon request by the CONSULTANT, shall designate in writing and shall advise the CONSULTANT in writing of one (1) or more of its employees to whom all communications pertaining to the day-to-day conduct of this Agreement shall be addressed. The designated representative shall have the authority to transmit instructions, receive information and interpret and define the COUNTY'S policy and decisions pertinent to the work covered by this Agreement.

(b) The CONSULTANT shall, at all times during the normal work week, designate or appoint one or more representatives of the CONSULTANT who are authorized to act in behalf of and bind the CONSULTANT regarding all matters involving the conduct of the performance pursuant to this Agreement and shall keep the COUNTY continually and effectively advised of such designation.

SECTION 22. ALL PRIOR AGREEMENTS SUPERSEDED. This document incorporates and includes all prior negotiations, correspondence, conversations, agreements or understandings applicable to the matters contained herein and the parties agree that there are no commitments, agreements or understandings concerning the subject matter of this Agreement that are not contained or referred to in this document.

Accordingly, it is agreed that no deviation from the terms hereof shall be predicated upon any prior representations or agreements, whether oral or written.

SECTION 23. MODIFICATIONS, AMENDMENTS OR ALTERATIONS. No modification, amendment or alteration in the terms or conditions contained herein shall be effective unless contained in a written document executed with the same formality and of equal dignity herewith.

SECTION 24. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR. It is agreed that nothing herein contained is intended or should be construed as in any manner creating or establishing a relationship of co-partners between the parties, or as constituting the CONSULTANT (including its officers, employees, and agents) the agent, representative, or employee of the COUNTY for any purpose, or in any manner, whatsoever. The CONSULTANT is to be and shall remain forever an independent contractor with respect to all services performed under this Agreement.

SECTION 25. EMPLOYEE STATUS. Persons employed by the CONSULTANT in the performance of services and functions pursuant to this Agreement shall have no claim to pension, workers' compensation, unemployment compensation, civil service or other employee rights or privileges granted to the COUNTY'S officers and employees either by operation of law or by the COUNTY.

SECTION 26. SERVICES NOT PROVIDED FOR. No claim for services furnished by the CONSULTANT not specifically provided for herein shall be honored by the COUNTY.

SECTION 27. PUBLIC RECORDS LAW. CONSULTANT acknowledges COUNTY'S obligations under Article I, Section 24, Florida Constitution and Chapter 119, Florida Statutes, to release public records to members of the public upon request. CONSULTANT acknowledges that COUNTY is required to comply with Article I, Section 24, Florida Constitution and Chapter

119, Florida Statutes, in the handling of the materials created under this Agreement and that said statute controls over the terms of this Agreement.

SECTION 28. COMPLIANCE WITH LAWS AND REGULATIONS. In providing all services pursuant to this Agreement, the CONSULTANT shall abide by all statutes, ordinances, rules, and regulations pertaining to, or regulating the provisions of, such services, including those now in effect and hereafter adopted. Any violation of said statutes, ordinances, rules, or regulations shall constitute a material breach of this Agreement, and shall entitle the COUNTY to terminate this Agreement immediately upon delivery of written notice of termination to the CONSULTANT.

SECTION 29. NOTICES. Whenever either party desires to give notice unto the other, it must be given by written notice, sent by registered or certified United States mail, with return receipt requested, addressed to the party for whom it is intended at the place last specified and the place for giving of notice shall remain such until it shall have been changed by written notice in compliance with the provisions of this Section. For the present, the parties designate the following as the respective places for giving of notice, to-wit:

FOR COUNTY:

Environmental Services
520 W. Lake Mary Blvd., Suite 200
Sanford, Florida 32773

FOR CONSULTANT:

PBS&J, Inc.
482 S. Keller Rd.
Orlando, Florida 32810-6101

SECTION 30. RIGHTS AT LAW RETAINED. The rights and remedies of the COUNTY, provided for under this Agreement, are in addition and supplemental to any other rights and remedies provided by law.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have made and executed this Agreement on the date below written for execution by the COUNTY.

ATTEST:

PBS&J, INC.

, Secretary

By: _____
, President

(CORPORATE SEAL)

Date: _____

ATTEST:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

MARYANNE MORSE
Clerk to the Board of
County Commissioners of
Seminole County, Florida.

By: _____
, Chairman

Date: _____

For use and reliance
of Seminole County only.

As authorized for execution by
the Board of County Commissioners
at their _____, 20____
regular meeting.

Approved as to form and
legal sufficiency.

County Attorney

AC/lpk
1/25/04
ps-5172

3 Attachments:

- Exhibit "A" - Scope of Services
- Exhibit "B" - Sample Work Order
- Exhibit "C" - Rate Schedule
- Exhibit "D" - Truth in Negotiations Certificate

EXHIBIT A

Master Agreement for Consumptive Use Permit Assistance

Scope of Work: Seminole County is seeking qualifications from firms to provide professional assistance with the preparation of Consumptive Use Permits (CUPs) and related negotiations with the St. Johns River Water Management District (District). An application to consolidate the County's various CUPs was submitted to the District in November 2003 and a request for additional information (RAI) has since been received from the District. A preliminary response to this RAI was developed under a separate agreement; however, further RAIs are anticipated. This master agreement will serve to continue the efforts completed to date and provide the County with professional services resulting in a consolidated CUP that cost effectively meets the water supply needs of Seminole County.

Work under this agreement may include but is not limited to: data collection and analysis, groundwater modeling and analysis, wetlands evaluations, limited water supply planning, evaluation of historical water use data, evaluation of future land uses, geographic information systems analysis, development of temporary consumptive use permits, coordination and negotiation meetings and any other related assignments that the County requests.

**Board of County Commissioners
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA**

WORK ORDER

Work Order Number: _____

Master Agreement No.: _____ Dated: _____

Contract Title: _____

Project Title: _____

Consultant: _____

Address: _____

ATTACHMENTS TO THIS WORK ORDER:

- drawings/plans/specifications
- scope of services
- special conditions
- _____
- _____

METHOD OF COMPENSATION:

- fixed fee basis
- time basis-not-to-exceed
- time basis-limitation of funds

TIME FOR COMPLETION: The services to be provided by the CONTRACTOR shall commence upon execution of this Agreement by the parties and shall be completed within "X" (days, months, years) of the effective date of this agreement. Failure to meet the completion date may be grounds for Termination for Default.

Work Order Amount: _____ DOLLARS (\$ _____)

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have made and executed this Work Order on this _____ day of _____, 20____, for the purposes stated herein.

(THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY THE COUNTY)

ATTEST:

(Company Name)

, Secretary

By: _____, President

(CORPORATE SEAL)

Date: _____

----- ***** ----- ***** ----- ***** ----- ***** -----

ATTEST:

BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
SEMINOLE COUNTY, FLORIDA

MARYANNE MORSE
Clerk to the Board of County Commissioners of
Seminole County, Florida

By: _____
Carlton D. Henley, Chairman

Date: _____

For use and reliance of Seminole County only.
Approved as to Form and legal sufficiency.

As authorized for execution by the Board of
County Commissioners at their _____,
20____ regular meeting.

County Attorney

WORK ORDER TERMS AND CONDITIONS

- a) Execution of this Work Order by the COUNTY shall serve as authorization for the CONSULTANT to provide, for the stated project, professional services as set out in the Scope of Services attached as Exhibit "A" to the Master Agreement cited on the face of this Work Order and as further delineated in the attachments listed on this Work Order.
- b) Term: This work order shall take effect on the date of its execution by the County and expires upon final delivery, inspection, acceptance and payment unless terminated earlier in accordance with the Termination provisions herein.
- c) The CONSULTANT shall provide said services pursuant to this Work Order, its Attachments, and the cited Master Agreement (as amended, if applicable) which is incorporated herein by reference as if it had been set out in its entirety.
- d) Whenever the Work Order conflicts with the cited Master Agreement, the Master Agreement shall prevail.
- e) METHOD OF COMPENSATION - If the compensation is based on a:
 - (i) FIXED FEE BASIS, then the Work Order Amount becomes the Fixed Fee Amount and the CONSULTANT shall perform all work required by this Work Order for the Fixed Fee Amount. The Fixed Fee is an all-inclusive Firm Fixed Price binding the CONSULTANT to complete the work for the Fixed Fee Amount regardless of the costs of performance. In no event shall the CONSULTANT be paid more than the Fixed Fee Amount.
 - (ii) TIME BASIS WITH A NOT-TO-EXCEED AMOUNT, then the Work Order Amount becomes the Not-to-Exceed Amount and the CONSULTANT shall perform all the work required by this Work Order for a sum not exceeding the Not-to-Exceed Amount. In no event is the CONSULTANT authorized to incur expenses exceeding the not-to-exceed amount without the express written consent of the COUNTY. Such consent will normally be in the form of an amendment to this Work Order. The CONSULTANT's compensation shall be based on the actual work required by this Work Order and the Labor Hour Rates established in the Master Agreement.
 - (iii) TIME BASIS WITH A LIMITATION OF FUNDS AMOUNT, then the Work Order Amount becomes the Limitation of Funds amount and the CONSULTANT is not authorized to exceed the Limitation of Funds amount without prior written approval of the COUNTY. Such approval, if given by the COUNTY, shall indicate a new Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT shall advise the COUNTY whenever the CONSULTANT has incurred expenses on this Work Order that equals or exceeds eighty percent (80%) of the Limitation of Funds amount. The CONSULTANT's compensation shall be based on the actual work required by this Work Order and the Labor Hour Rates established in the Master Agreement.
- f) Payment to the CONSULTANT shall be made by the COUNTY in strict accordance with the payment terms of the referenced Master Agreement.
- g) It is expressly understood by the CONSULTANT that this Work Order, until executed by the COUNTY, does not authorize the performance of any services by the CONSULTANT and that the COUNTY, prior to its execution of the Work Order, reserves the right to authorize a party other than the CONSULTANT to perform the services called for under this Work Order; if it is determined that to do so is in the best interest of the COUNTY.
- h) The CONSULTANT shall sign the Work Order first and the COUNTY second. This Work Order becomes effective and binding upon execution by the COUNTY and not until then. A copy of this Work Order will be forwarded to the CONSULTANT upon execution by the COUNTY.

Exhibit "C"
Rate Schedule

Truth in Negotiations Certificate

This is to certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief, the wage rates and other factual unit costs supporting the compensation (as defined in section 287.055 of the Florida Statutes (otherwise known as the "Consultants' Competitive Negotiations Act" or CCNA) and required under CCNA subsection 287.055 (5) (a)) submitted to Seminole County Purchasing and Contracts Division, Contracts Section, either actually or by specific identification in writing, in support of PS- _____ * are accurate, complete, and current as of _____ (Date)**.

This certification includes the wage rates and other factual unit costs supporting any Work Orders or Amendments issued under the agreement between the Consultant and the County.

Firm _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Title _____

Date of execution*** _____

* Identify the proposal, request for price adjustment, or other submission involved, giving the appropriate identifying number (e.g., PS No.).

** Insert the day, month, and year when wage rates were submitted or, if applicable, an earlier date agreed upon between the parties that is as close as practicable to the date of agreement on compensation.

*** Insert the day, month, and year of signing.

(End of certificate)